REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above-identified application. No new subject matter is added. It is respectfully submitted that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated March 7, 2006.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, 19, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Sigiura et al.* (US 2002/080391). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position and request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of the aforementioned claims.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference the disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. However, *Sigiura et al.* fails to disclose several elements of the claimed invention.

For instance, *Sigiura et al.* fails to teach or suggest an Internet printing method comprising *providing a proxy unit on the Internet.* Instead, *Sigiura et al.,* discloses arranging the print server 23 (which the examiner alleges to correspond to the proxy unit of the present invention) at LAN 2.

Also, *Sigiura et al.* fails to teach or suggest *converting a protocol into a protocol which allows circumventing the firewall of the print server.* *Sigiura et al.* does not discuss a system or a method wherein a firewall is provided <u>between the proxy unit and the print server</u>. Instead, *Sigiura et al.* describes, for example, that the HTTP data generating portion 333 of the device 33

converts print data using IPP into HTTP format. This means that, according to the configuration of *Sigiura et al.*, the conversion of IPP data into HTTP format is performed on the side of the client that has made printing service request. One reason that this configuration is disadvantageous, for example, is that the HTTP data generating portion 333 must be provided in every client that makes a printing service request.

As described above, claims 1, 8, 15, and 19 of the present invention differ from the invention of *Sigiura et al.* at least in the place where the proxy unit is provided and in the place where conversion into a protocol such as HTTP which allows circumventing the firewall takes place. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the anticipation rejection is not properly supported by *Sigiura et al.* and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 19, and 21-24 depend from independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 19. Accordingly, these claims should likewise be allowable in view of the above remarks by nature of dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement that claims 4, 11, 18, and 20 are allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable in view of the above remarks.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants

request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate

extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect

to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Darrin A. Auito
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,024
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/rf